

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/781,848	02/20/2004	Stanford W. Crane JR.	040879-5094-01	1659
9629	7590 02/03/2006		EXAMINER	
MORGAN LEWIS & BOCKIUS LLP			THAI, LUAN C	
	YLVANIA AVENUE NW DN, DC 20004		THAI, LUAN C ART UNIT PAPER NU	PAPER NUMBER
			2891	
			DATE MAILED: 02/03/2006	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)	_			
	10/781,848	CRANE ET AL.	$\langle m \rangle$			
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit	(11			
	Luan Thai	2891				
The MAILING DATE of this communication ap Period for Reply	pears on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence addre	SS			
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPL THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION. - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1. after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a rep If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statut Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailine earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from e, cause the application to become ABANDONE	nely filed s will be considered timely. the mailing date of this commi	unication.			
Status						
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 17 h	November 2005.					
2a)☐ This action is FINAL . 2b)☒ This	☐ This action is FINAL . 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.					
Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.						
Disposition of Claims						
 4) Claim(s) 27-30 is/are pending in the application 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdra 5) Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) Claim(s) 27-29 is/are rejected. 7) Claim(s) 30 is/are objected to. 8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or 	wn from consideration.					
Application Papers						
9) The specification is objected to by the Examine						
10)⊠ The drawing(s) filed on <u>20 February 2004</u> is/are: a)⊠ accepted or b)□ objected to by the Examiner.						
Applicant may not request that any objection to the	• • •	` '				
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the E.			• •			
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119						
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority document 2. Certified copies of the priority document 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority application from the International Burea * See the attached detailed Office action for a list	ts have been received. Its have been received in Application It documents have been received in the control of the control o	on No ed in this National Sta	ge			
Attachment(s)						
Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date	4) Interview Summary Paper No(s)/Mail Da 5) Notice of Informal Pa 6) Other:	ite	2)			

DETAILED ACTION

This Office Action is responsive to the Request for Reconsideration filed November 17, 2005.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
 - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 2. Claim 27 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Murphy et al. (5,742,481 hereafter "Murphy-481" of record) in view of Hembree (6,504,389).

Regarding claim 27, Murphy-481 (see specifically figures 1 and 7-8-9) discloses a semiconductor die package comprising: a package base (e.g., alignment member or guide member) including a plurality of side walls (224) and a floor (214) having a plurality of holes (236) formed therethrough, wherein interior surfaces of the side walls and floor form a cavity sized to hold a semiconductor die (202). Murphy-481 further discloses electrically conductive frames (206) formed into the floor (214), each conductive frame (206) having a hole formed therein (see figure 9) and the hole through the floor (214) registering with the hole (236) of the frame; eclectically-conductive pins (212) inserting into the holes (236) in the floor (214) such that the pins pass into the holes of the frame (206) and extend from an exterior surface of the floor (214) (see figure 7-8); coupling solder balls (204) to the frames (206) and to the pins (212) (Col. 6, lines 28+). Thus, Murphy-481 does teach a package base (e.g., alignment member or

guide member) including a plurality of sidewalls (224) and a floor (214), and an electrically conductive frame (206) formed into the floor (214) but Murphy-481 fails to disclose the package base being formed by *molding* with the conductive frame molded into the floor of the package base.

It should be noted that molding process is widely used to form a package base (e.g., alignment member or guide member with conductive frames molded into the floor of the package base) in semiconductor art since it provides a simplest way to form the package base. For instance, Hembree (see Figs. 4C-4D) discloses a package base (46/48) (e.g., alignment member or guide member) including sidewalls (48) and a floor (46) with conductive frames (52) molded into the floor (46) of the package base, and the package base is formed by molding process (Col. 9, lines 6+).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to use molding process to form the package base since such process is commonly used in the art, as taught by Hembree.

Note that the specification contains no disclosure of either the critical nature of the claimed "molding process" in forming the package base or any unexpected results arising therefrom. Thus, one skilled in the art at the time the invention was made would have been obvious to use any process, including molding process as disclose by Hembree, to form the package base in Murphy-481's package.

Application/Control Number: 10/781,848 Page 4

Art Unit: 2891

3. Claims 28-29 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Murphy et al. (5,742,481 hereafter "Murphy-481" of record) and Hembree (6,504,389) as applied to claim 27 and further in view of Murphy (5,877,554 hereafter "Murphy-554" of record).

Regarding claims 28-29, the proposed method of "Murphy-481" and Hembree discloses the claimed invention as detailed above except for teaching a lid being attached to the sidewalls of the base.

"Murphy-554" while related to a similar structure design teach lid (30) being attached to the sidewalls of the base (26-16) for securing the package device into the housing assembly (Col. 4, lines 4+). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to recognize that combining "Murphy-554" teaching of the lid with "Murphy-481" invention would have been beneficial because Murphy-554" teaching helps securing the package device into the housing assembly.

Allowable Subject Matter

- Claim 30 is objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if 4. rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.
- 5. The following is a statement of reasons for the indication of allowable subject matter:

The prior art taken either singly or in combination fails to anticipate or fairly suggest the method steps of: placing a substrate over the solder ball; placing the semiconductor die on the substrate, and electrically connecting the semiconductor die to the substrate, as recited in claim 30; especially when these limitations are considered within the specific combination claimed.

Application/Control Number: 10/781,848

Art Unit: 2891

6. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner

should be directed to Luan Thai whose telephone number is 571-272-1935. The examiner can normally

Page 5

be reached on 6:30 AM - 5:00 PM, Monday to Thursday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor,

Bradley W. Baumeister can be reached on 571-272-1722. The fax phone number for the organization

where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application

Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained

from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available

through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-

direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the

Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Luan Thai

Primary Examiner Art Unit 2891

January 31, 2006